



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 0664MH-35583

#5 Sedan
p10
12/19/03

In re Application of:

JOHN A. KUELBS ET AL.

Serial No. 09/619,947

Filed: 20 JULY 2000

*Need to note that this is
data 1.132
section =*

For: METHOD OF PRODUCING, SELLING, AND DISTRIBUTING ARTICLES OF MANUFACTURE

DECLARATION OF JAMES MUNCH, PHD

1. I was asked by counsel for World Factory, the patent applicant, to review the pending patent application, office action, and cited prior, and to comment on the soundness of the Examiner's logic in making the rejection based upon "official notice". I was also asked to comment on the novelty of the present invention over the cited prior art.
2. My resume is attached as an exhibit to this declaration.
3. Based on my review, in my opinion, the term "early adopters" was ill-defined and misunderstood by the examiner when he stated that is old and well known that early adopters pay less, not more for products.
4. Early adopters of products typically pay more, not less. So, I spent considerable time trying to find the best method of explaining the notion to the Examiner. I have written about this below. In fact, as you will read below, Walker correctly presents the notion of "early adopters" in his patent

overview. In fact, Walker uses this idea as leverage to argue for the uniqueness of his early reward system. In my view, the examiner simply doesn't understand it, or is being too loose with his wording when he uses the term that "early adopters" pay less. Or, he may be using "early adopters" to mean Walker's rewarded "early joiners."

5. More specifically, on page 3 of the Office Action, the claim is made that it is old and well known in the art to offer lower prices to people who are early adopters.

6. On the contrary, much literature in marketing and pricing suggests just the opposite. Specifically, when products are introduced into the marketplace, an extremely common approach is price skimming, which is pricing at a very high level so as to recover research and development costs, capital equipment costs and other fixed costs associated with the introduction. Only after the early adopter market segments buy the product, do prices begin to be systematically reduced. There are many classic examples, but perhaps the most obvious examples are in the personal computer industry.

7. The following quotation from a marketing textbook illustrates this strategy: "Many companies that invent new products initially set high prices to "skim" revenues layer by layer from the market. Intel is a prime user of this strategy, which called **market-skimming pricing**. When Intel first introduces a new computer chip, it charges a premium price, a price that makes it *just* worthwhile for some segments of the market to adopt computers containing the chip. The new chips power top-of-the-line PCs and servers purchased by customers who just can't wait. As initial sales

slow down, and as competitors threaten to introduce similar chips, Intel lowers the price to draw in the next price-sensitive layer of customers. Prices eventually bottom out at a level that makes the chip a hot mass-market processor. In this way, Intel skims a maximum amount of revenue from the various segments of the market." This quote is from the following publications: Marketing: an introduction, Armstrong, Gary and Philip Kotler, 6th edition, 2003, Chapter 10, pg. 371; and Edward F. Moltzen, "Intel Cuts Chip Pricing Again, CRN, June 4, 2001, p.12.

8. The Walker patent is in essential agreement with this understanding. He discusses, by example, how cellular phones have decreased in price from \$10,000 to the range of \$100 to \$200. Furthermore, Walker argues, that "To stimulate sales, particularly sales of new products, many businesses offer various promotions as an incentive to purchase the products." See Walker, Column 1, lines 55-67.

9. The Walker patent then goes on to describe multi-level marketing and the creation of an **early adopter consumer reward system**. In my marketing opinion, the innovation of the Walker patent "rests" on this notion of early adopter rewards to final consumers, the end-users of a product. The focus of Walker is on influencing or rewarding consumer choice by using rewards but which are not incorporated into the price paid initially by the purchaser. See Bettman, James, An Information Processing Theory of Choice, John Wiley and sons, Inc., (1976).

10. In the rejection 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner argues "though an invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be

patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains." I disagree. It is my belief that the subject matter in Application/Control Number: 09/619,947 is unique and is not obvious or well known in the area of business marketing and pricing. Taking the point-of-view of the manufacturer, this application develops a method by which a manufacturer can incorporate an extended or hybrid type of Traditional and Activity Based Costing approach (a plurality of pricing milestones p. 38), for product design, pre-production, production, packaging, packing-for-shipment, shipping, warehousing, and in-stock inventory stages of an article for manufacture. The resulting pricing is thus shared with potential buyers PRIOR to actually engaging in these processes. These potential "activities' costs" are made known to potential buyers such that the resulting marketplace exchange results in a win-win situation. For example, buyers may opt to exchange for the product at any stage of the process, thereby opting-in for as much risk as they like. They will choose to share as much "stage-based costing" as they wish, and the earlier they opt-in, the lower the pricing and greater the level of risk. Shkedy provides only a final stage delivered price, with no opportunity for the buyers to participate in particular portions of the supply chain in which the buyer may have the comparative advantage (such as transportation or storage cost) as compared to some other market participant or the seller's cost for the activity in a given supply chain stage. Walker does not address the situation of a manufacturer having to decide whether or not to produce commodity products. The World Factory method accounts for the information necessary to make/don't make decision based on indications of demand being registered in a timely manner on items which are seasonally or occasionally produced. For these items (such as nails, garden tools, hand

tools) the notion of an early adopter in the sense of Walker is irrelevant to the question that the World Factory invention answers, which is: for a particular supplier X, at time Y, with existing production capability, should it commence production, and, if yes, for how many, how long, and how much? This is essentially a market for manufacturing capacity in its first stage which recognizes that the most difficult obstacle for a manufacturer is gauging whether there is sufficient initial quantity to set up a line and begin production.

11. The other major claim rejection relates to claims 8, 27, and 46 regarding Shkedy and the pooling of offers of a plurality of buyers. While the World Factory process of the present application may provide for this, the central value-added by the method/approach is certainly only tangentially related to the buyer pooling process. In so far as an in-part production guarantee, re; claims 19, 38, 39, and 56, (see page 5 of the Examiner's Detailed Action), the World Factory application suggests simultaneously arriving –not at a production guarantee—but at a range of pricing milestones (see p. 38, #10) guarantees through a' priori designing the degree of "risk shared ness" desired by the buyers and sellers throughout the process.

12. In the World Factory patent application, buyers and sellers simultaneously share in the development of a manufacturing pricing process. The notion of early adopting is really way too narrow in characterizing the World Factory application anyway. The use of the invention described in the World Factory application as a tool to be used simultaneously by manufacturer and buyer clearly suggests something far more unique than either Walker or Shkedy.

13. In the World Factory invention, buyers react (accept or reject) individually (their choices are aggregated but not coordinated) during the process of the order gathering. Also, buyers in the World Factory invention have a general but anonymous view of the accumulation of demand. The World Factory interface for order gathering furthermore takes into account the realities of the standardized nature of shipping containers which imposes the very practical and real constraint of accumulating orders such that the objects fit and fully fill said standardized containers, in order to minimize landed cost. This is a crucial factor in many of the varied goods, such as outdoor furniture, tools, and staples which have a relatively low value compared to the cost of freight.

14. This cost-price risk tradeoff decision for potential buyers may be thought of as a method of quantifying the price elasticity of demand. For example, by agreeing to exchange early in the process, both buyer and seller are agreeing to quantify demand uncertainties and hence, reduce certain traditional and activities costs. In the literature listing below, perhaps best references are "Activities based Costing" approaches.

15. Also, the ideas following publication about buyers and sellers intervening in the new products development process are relevant. The idea of intervening early in the process of new product development is old and well established in the marketing literature. For example, the earlier a supplier firm intervenes to help define the product specifications, search for sources of supply, and so on for a new product, the greater the likelihood of a successful exchange. See the following References:

1. Patrick J. Robinson, Charles W. Faris, and Yoram Wind, *Industrial Buying Behavior and Creative Marketing*, (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1967).

2. Erin Anderson, Weyien Chu, and Barton Weitz, "Industrial Purchasing: An Empirical Exploration of the Buyclass Framework," *Journal of Marketing*, July 1987, pp. 71-87.

3. Cynthia Webster, "Buying Involvement in Purchasing Success," *Industrial Marketing Management*, August 1993, p. 199.

4. Edward G. Brierty, Robert W. Eckles, and Robert Reeder, *Business Marketing*, 3rd. edition, Prentice-Hall, 1998, pp. 74-82.

16. The approach of the World Factory patent may be thought of as a framework or a means for gathering and transmission of inputs to a method or algorithm for pre-determining the price for a yet to be manufactured product. Thus, it interactively helps both manufacturers and buyers. While this process does focus on buyers' early product adoptions and in some instances could be used by end-use consumers (Walker), its major purpose is not to facilitate a collective purchase by buyers (Shkedy).

17. Shkedy does not realistically address the issues of coordinating the delivery of significant wholesale quantities to a business user in the context of standardized shipping containers. Business-to-Business Markets are more complex than Consumer markets: "In some ways, business markets are similar to consumer markets. Both involve people who assume buying roles and make purchase decisions to satisfy needs. However, business markets

differ in many ways from consumer markets. The main differences are in *market structure and demand, the nature of the buying unit, and the types of decisions and the decision process* involved." See Marketing and Introduction." Marketing: an introduction, Armstrong, Gary and Philip Kotler, Prentice-Hall, 6th edition, 2003, Chapter 6, p.215. The World Factory invention permits the rational planning for delivery within supply chain constraints such as:

1. the existence of standardized shipping containers;
2. the need to fill those shipping containers at a high utilization rate;
3. the need to insure the geographic proximity of sellers to the container loading point;
4. the need to coordinate the geographic proximity of buyers within a delivery area; and
5. the need in general to minimize transaction costs such as freight, consolidation, customs, destination, and insurance, all of which contribute to an items landed cost.

"Buyers usually face more complex buying decisions than do consumer buyers. Purchases often involve large sums of money, complex technical and economic considerations, and interactions among many people at many levels of the buyer's organization. Because the purchases are more complex, business buyers may take longer to make their decisions. The business buying process tends to be more formalized than the consumer buying process. Large purchase orders usually call for detailed product specifications, written purchase orders, careful supplier searches, and formal approval. Finally, in the business buying process, buyer and seller are often much more dependent on each other." See Marketing an Introduction,"

Armstrong, Gary and Philip Kotler, Prentice-Hall, 6th edition, 2003, Chapter 6, p.216.

18. Dynamic pricing Example: "In the fall of 2000 the world's largest online retailer, Amazon.com, used its vast information database and substantial technological infrastructure to experiment with dynamic pricing—charging each customer based on his/her implied willingness to pay. Dynamic pricing is broadly defined as the buying and selling of goods and services in markets where prices are free to adjust in response to supply and demand conditions at the individual transaction level." See Ellen Garbarino and Olivia F. Lee, "Dynamic Pricing in Internet Retail: Effects on Consumer Trust," *Psychology and Marketing*, Vol. 20 (6) June 2003, p. 496. The approach can include a number of auction models, but the form that attracts most retailers is the ability to use newly available information to individually set prices based on a customer's willingness to pay. One might argue that this is a driver for reward based pricing models.

19. Although dynamic pricing is something is not a concern in the World Factory patent application, the on-line auction approaches like Walker/Priceline do. For World Factory, dynamic pricing is not used. Instead, the buyer and manufacturer create their exchange based on the agreed upon pricing milestones. They remove price elasticity of demand from the market by a priori sharing the risks agreed upon according to where they opt into the pricing milestones. The World Factory invention recognizes that there is significant "lumpiness" in costs as an item moves through stages in the supply chain. For example, space on a standardized shipping container (normally 20 feet, and most commonly 40 feet) is need to economically import more than a few hundred pounds of any commodity.

Other options such as LCL (less than a container load) and air freight are available, but for many commodity items are not economically viable. Fixed freight costs must be amortized over a sufficient volume of articles to ensure that freight as a percentage landed costs is in line with other goods in the market. The offered goods from a given supplier in the World Factory invention allows for a price offering which reflects how well a given supplier is able, or not able, to manage costs within a given supply chain stage. The World Factory invention allows for a more efficient parsing of competitive advantage among suppliers and buyers who may have relative price advantage in the activities of one supply chain stage versus another. These advantages essentially have a way to be articulated and to "ride on" or "attach to" the underlying goods moving through the supply chain in a way that is novel compared to prior models which do not contemplate the transparent and segmentable electronic supply chain that the present invention embodies or creates.

20. Derived Demand: The World Factory application does not simply concern itself with consumer rewards or with rewarding end-users' for early product choice. In stark contrast, this approach is focused on a simultaneous business-to-business approach to calculate the value of potential exchanges at various key milestones from the design stage to the eventual in-stock stage for an article of manufacture. This model creates a unique framework which allows for the valuation of activity in each supply chain stage. This framework provides a means for suppliers and buyers to capture his own comparative advantage at each stage

21. I hereby declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to

be true; and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

Date: 11/24/03

James M. Munch
James Munch, PhD

RESUME

James M. Munch, Ph.D.
Professor of Marketing
College of Business Administration
Department of Marketing
The University of Texas at Arlington
P. O. Box 19469
Arlington, TX 76019-0469

Office (817) 272-2258

Home Address:
1402 Meadow Lane
Southlake, TX 76092-8339
(817) 488-8248

PERSONAL

Marital Status: Married
Citizenship: United States of America
Excellent Health

EDUCATION

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
Doctor of Philosophy in Marketing, August, 1983

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY
Masters of Business Administration in Marketing, January 1975

ST. BONAVENTURE UNIVERSITY
Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Cum Laude, June 1973

BUSINESS EXPERIENCE

FEDERAL WHOLESALE COMPANY, June 1975-September 1978
Sales representative
Straight commission salesperson for a full service national
housewares and hardware distributor. Represented 300 National Manufacturers'
product lines and sold to national and regional discount department stores and corporate
headquarters. Consistently a top performer in terms of new accounts, sales volume, and
profits.

CARNATION COMPANY, January 1975-June 1975

Sales representative, Grocery Products Marketing Division
Field salesperson calling on retailers and corporate buyers.

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

Full Professor of Marketing, September 1999 to present

Tenured Associate Professor of Marketing, September 1993-1999

COURSES TAUGHT

Graduate Marketing:

Seminar in Marketing Strategy (Ph.D)

Seminar in Consumer Research (Ph.D.)

Consumer Behavior (MBA/MSMR)

Industrial Marketing (MBA/MSMR)

Marketing Management (MBA/MSMR)

Marketing Strategy (MBA/MSMR)

Marketing Communications (MBA/MSMR)

Undergraduate Marketing:

Consumer Behavior

Principles of Marketing

Integrated Marketing Communications

Retailing

Personal Selling/ Sales Management

International Marketing

Marketing Strategy and Planning

RELATED TEACHING EXPERIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT DALLAS

Executive MBA Program: Marketing Strategy,
Fall-Spring, 2002-2003

On-Line Executive MBA Program: Marketing Strategy,
Summer 2002-2003

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS SOUTHWESTERN MEDICAL CENTER/ UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT DALLAS: EXECUTIVE/PHYSICIAN CERTIFICATE IN MEDICAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Service Quality and Patient Satisfaction Course,
April 2002

Strategic Management of Healthcare Organizations Course,
August 2002

SOUTHERN METHODIST UNIVERSITY

Undergraduate Courses:

Consumer Behavior 2001, 2003

International Marketing 2002

Retailing 2002

MBA Courses:

Buyer Behavior 2003

DOCTORAL COMMITTEES

Chairperson for:

Sam Powell, UTA
Marketing Ph.D. candidate

Ethan Christensen, UTA
Marketing Ph.D. candidate

Scott Wysong, UTA
Marketing Ph.D. completed 5/2001

Chien Le, UTA
Marketing Ph.D. completed 7/1999

David Ha, UTA
Marketing Ph.D., completed 5/1998

Gary Gregory, UTA
Marketing Ph.D., completed 5/1997

Joneta D. Mosley-Matchett, UTA
Marketing Ph.D., completed 5/1997

Notis Pagiavlas, UTA
Marketing Ph.D., completed 8/1996

Karin Braunsberger, UTA
Marketing Ph.D., completed 6/1996

Brian Buckler, UTA
Marketing Ph.D., completed 6/1996

Committee member for:

Molly Alpert, UTA, M.S. Administration, completed 6/ 2003

Paula Daly, UTA
Management Ph.D., completed 5/1997

Tammy Gebara, UTA
MS Education, completed 12/1996

Rusty Juban, UTA
Management Ph.D., completed 8/1996

Bruce Walters, UTA
Management Ph.D., completed 8/1996

Michaelle Cameron, UTA
Marketing Ph.D., completed 6/1996

Toni McNutt, UTA
Ph.D. Marketing, completed 6/1995

James A. Walker, UTA
Ph.D. Marketing, completed 8/1994

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

Tenured Associate Professor of Marketing, effective with 1993-94 academic

appointment.

Associate Professor of Marketing, July 1990 to May 1993

COURSES TAUGHT

Graduate Marketing:

Ph.D. Seminar in Marketing Theory

Undergraduate Marketing:

Marketing Management

Industrial Sales Management

DOCTORAL COMMITTEES

Michael J. Tharp, Kent State University
Ph.D. Marketing, completed 12/1994

Mark F. Toncar, Kent State University
Ph.D. Marketing, completed 8/1994

Deborah Skinner, Kent State University
Ph.D. Marketing, completed 8/1994

Alan R. Miciak, Kent State University
Ph.D. Marketing, completed 6/1993

Linda Ueltschy, Kent State University
Ph.D. Marketing, completed 6/1993

THE UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE

Tenured Associate Professor Business Administration, May 1989 - July 1990

Assistant Professor of Business Administration, September 1983 - May 1989

COURSES TAUGHT

Graduate Marketing:

Marketing Administration (MBA)

Undergraduate Marketing:

Marketing Management
Buyer Behavior
Advertising Management

RESEARCH

Refereed Articles

Wysong, Scott, James M. Munch, and Susan Kleiser, "The Role of Personality Antecedents in Building Brands," (2003) Proceedings of the American Marketing Association, Winter Educators' Conference, Orlando, Florida

Gregory, Gary D., James M. Munch, and Mark Peterson, (2002) "Attitude Functions in Consumer Research: Comparing Value-Attitude Relations in Individualist and Collectivist Cultures," Journal of Business Research, Vol. 55, #2. p. 933-942.

Toncar, Mark F., James M. Munch, and Amy S. Bortz, (2002) "Ad Claim Believability, Importance, and Memory: The Effects of Simple and Complex Tropes," Association of Marketing Theory and Practice: Expanding Marketing Horizons Into The 21st Century Proceedings. (Best Paper in Track)

Wysong, Scott, James M. Munch and Susan Kleiser,(2002) "Is Brand Personality a Process? An Investigation into the Brand Personality Construct, its Antecedents, and its Consequences," American Marketing Association Winter Educators', Conference Proceedings.

Toncar, Mark F. and James M. Munch, (2001) "Consumer Responses to Tropes in Print Advertising," Journal of Advertising, Spring, Vol. 30, number 1.

Toncar, Mark F., James M. Munch and Melanie Gibson, (2000) "Exploring Memory for Tropes in Print Advertising," Association of Marketing Theory and Practice Conference Proceedings

Gregory, Gary, James M. Munch and Mark Peterson, (1999) "An Investigation of Value Structures in the U.S. and Columbia: Implications for the development of Ad Appeals," The Seventh Symposium on Cross-Cultural Research, sponsored by ACR and The Society for Consumer Psychology.

Braunsberger, Karin and James M. Munch, (1998) "Source Expertise versus Experience Effects in Hospital Advertising," Journal of Services Marketing, Vol. 12, No. 1, pages 23-39.

Toncar, Mark F. and James M. Munch (1998) "Conversational Sensitivity: The Role of Cognitive and Affective Individual Differences in Persuasion," Association of Marketing Theory and Practice Conference, Charleston/Mt. Pleasant, South Carolina, March 21-23, 1998.

Peterson, Mark, Gary Gregory and James M. Munch (1998) "Equipment Failure Recovery: An Etic Dimension of Medical Technology Field-Service Quality in Europe and the United States," AMA Winter Educators' Conference Proceedings, Austin, Texas, February 21-24, 1998.

Gregory, Gary, Mark Peterson and James M. Munch (1997) "Extending Attitude Function Theory to Cross-Cultural Consumer Research," Sixth Symposium on Cross Cultural Consumer and Business Studies, Honolulu, Hawaii, December 1997.

Gary D. Gregory and James M. Munch, (1997) "The Importance of Cultural Values in International Advertising: An Examination of Familial Norms and Roles in Mexico," Psychology and Marketing, March, Vol. 14, Number 2 p.99-120.

Gary D. Gregory and James M. Munch, (1996), "Reconceptualizing Individualism-Collectivism in Consumer Behavior," Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 23 p. 104-110.

Lee C. Simmons and James M. Munch (1996), "Is Relationship Marketing Culturally and Structurally Bound? A Look at Guanxi in China," Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 23 p. 92-103.

Mark F. Toncar, James M. Munch and Michael A. Mayo (1995), "Using Conversation Theory to Investigate Conclusion-Drawing: Implications for Persuasion," Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 21 p. 343-347.

Mark F. Toncar, James M. Munch and Michael Y. Hu (1994), "Examining Consumers' Thoughts During a Telemarketing Message," Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, Vol. 2, No. 3 (September), 46-56.

Munch, James M., Gregory W. Boller, and John L. Swasy (1993), "The Effects of Argument Structure and Affective Tagging on Product Attitude Formation," Journal of Consumer Research, 20 (September), pages 294-302.

Pavelchak, Mark A., John H. Antil, and James M. Munch, (1993), "Why Do People Recall TV Ads? A Comparison of Viewer Beliefs and Objective

Contextual Determinants of Recall," Winter Educators' AMA Conference Proceedings, The American Marketing Association, p. 179-186.

Munch, James M., Paul J. Albanese, Michael A. Mayo, and Lawrence J. Marks (1991), "The Role of Personality in Moral Development in Consumers' Ethical Decision Making," in eds. F. Robert Dwyer and Mary Gilly, AMA Educators' Proceedings, Summer, Vol.2 p. 299-308.

Boller, Gregory W. , John L. Swasy and James M. Munch (1990), "Conceptualizing Argument Quality via Argument Structure", Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 17, Marvin E. Goldberg, Gerald Gorn and Richard W. Pollay, Editors, (Provo, UT: Association for Consumer Research) p. 321-328.

Pavelchak, Mark A., John H. Antil and James M. Munch (1988), "The Super Bowl: An Investigation into the Relationship Among Program Context, Emotional Experience, and Recall for Commercials," Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 15, No. 3, (December) 360-367.

Munch, James M. and John L. Swasy (1988), "Rhetorical Question, Summarization Frequency, and Argument Strength Effects on Recall," Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 15, No. 1, (June) 69-76.

Antil, John H. and James M. Munch (1988), "Drugstore Shoppers: Who Are They and What Do They Buy?" Journal of Pharmaceutical Marketing and Management, Vol. 2, No. 3, (Spring) 11-38.

Swasy, John L. and James M. Munch (1985), "Examining the Target of Receiver Elaborations: Rhetorical Question Effects on Source Processing and Persuasion," Journal of Consumer Research, Vol. 11, No. 4, (March) 877-886.

Clogg, Clifford C. and James M. Munch (1984), "Using Simultaneous Latent Structure Models to Analyze Group Differences: Exploratory Analysis of Buying Style Items," Journal of Business Research, Vol. 12, 319-336.

Munch, James M. and John L. Swasy (1983), "A Conceptual View of Questions and Questioning in Marketing Communications," in Richard P. Bagozzi and Alice M. Tybout (ed.), Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 10, (Ann Arbor, Michigan, Association for Consumer Research), 209-214.

Clogg, Clifford C., James M. Munch, and Daniel G. Callahan (1982), "Application of Latent Structure Models in Marketing Research: Exploratory Analysis of Buying Style Items," in W. R. Darden, K. B. Monroe, and W. R. Dillon (ed.), Research Methods and Causal Modeling in Marketing, (Chicago, American Marketing Association), 32-36.

Munch, James M. and John L. Swasy (1980), "An Examination of Information Processing Traits: General Social Confidence and Information Processing Confidence," in Kent B. Monroe (ed.), Advances in Consumer Research, Vol. 8, (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Association for Consumer Research), 349-354.

CHAPTERS IN BOOKS

Antil, John H. and James M. Munch (1992), Chapter 6, "Drugstore Shoppers: Who Are They and What Do They Buy?" Marketing Pharmaceutical Services: Patron Loyalty, Satisfaction, and Preferences, Smith, Harry A. and Stephen Joel Coons (Eds.), Pharmaceutical Products Press (Imprint of the Hayworth Press), Binghamton, NY. Pages 71-98.* This chapter is a reprint of the journal article listed above.

RESEARCH UNDER REVIEW OR IN PROGRESS

Under Review:

Toncar, Mark F., James M. Munch, and Amy S. Bortz, (Second Review) "The Role of Cognitive Processing and Emotional Reactions to Simple and Complex Tropes," Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice

In Progress:

"Using Ad Structure Variations to Facilitate Consumers' Message Elaboration and Persuasion," with Mark F. Toncar.

"The Power of Sales Stories." with Mark Toncar.

"Brand Personality and The Store Brand Development Process," with Scott Wysong and Sri Beldona.

"The Role of Brand Personality in Strategy Formation," with Scott Wysong and Susan Kleiser.

EDITORIAL REVIEW BOARDS

Journal of Business Research

Buyer Behavior Section, 1989 to present

Psychology and Marketing

Ad hoc Editor, July 1993 - December 1994

Consulting Editor, First Term, Jan. 1995 - Dec. 1997.

Consulting Editor, Second Term, Jan. 1997 to present

Journal of Consumer and Marketing Research

Editorial Board Member 1998 to present
<http://www.vancouver.wsu.edu/~jcmr>

MANUSCRIPT REVIEWER

Journal of Business Research, Editorial Review Board Reviewer, 1988 to present

Psychology and Marketing, Editorial Review Board Reviewer, 1993 to present

Journal of Consumer Research, Ad Hoc Reviewer, 1988 to present

American Marketing Association, Educators Conference Proceedings 1986, 1989, 1990, 1991

American Marketing Association Winter Educators' Conference Proceedings 1989, 1990, 1991, 1993, 1994, 1998

American Psychological Association, Division 23, 1989

Association for Consumer Research, 1990, 1997, 1998

Midwest AIDS Proceedings, 1985

Southwestern Marketing Association Conference 1994

Marketing and Public Policy Conference 1994, 1995

GRANTS AND PROPOSALS

National Science Foundation Grant: Decision, Risk, and Management Proposal
REF: SES-8803147, "Inducing Rankings From Pairwise Comparisons," 1988,
With William V. Gehrlein, (Not Supported)

"The Super Bowl: An Investigation Into the Relationship Among Program
Context, Emotional Experience, and Recall for Commercials," 1986, University
of Delaware College of Business and Economics Grant

"Rhetorical Question Effects," 1984, University of Delaware General University
Research Grant

ACADEMIC SERVICE ACTIVITY

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

UNIVERSITY :

University Provost Review Committee, 2001, 2002

University Faculty Senate, First term: 1996-1998

University Faculty Senate, Second term: 1999-2001

University Studies Committee: 2003

COLLEGE:

College Dean's Search Committee, 2000-2001

College Ph.D. Committee, 1994-2003

College AACSB Doctoral Committee 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997

College AACSB Intellectual Contributions Committee 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997

College AACSB Teaching Excellence Committee 1993-1998

Coordinator, College Ph.D. Colloquium, 1996, 1997

College Teaching Excellence Committee 1998-2000

College Research Committee 1998- 2003

DEPARTMENT:

Chair, Department of Graduate Studies Committee 2003

Chair Marketing Department Faculty Recruiting 1995, 1996

Acting Department Chairman, Marketing Department, Summer 2002

Acting PhD Coordinator, July-August 2002

Marketing Department Recruiting Committee 2002, 2003

Marketing Department Graduate Studies Committee 1993-2002

Marketing Department Promotion and Tenure Committee 1993-2003

Marketing Ph.D. Program Advisor, 1994-2000

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

College Strategic Planning Committee 1992, 1993

College Ph.D. Committee 1993

College Curriculum Committee 1991, 1992

College Faculty Advisory Council 1990

Marketing Faculty Recruiting Committee 1991

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE

Deans' Faculty Advisory and Planning Council 1989-1990

Committee on Organization, College of Business 1989

College Promotion and Tenure Committee 1989, 1990

Marketing Faculty Committee Representative for Chair Search, Department of Business Administration 1988

Chair, Marketing Area Faculty Recruiting, Department of Business Administration 1988

Committee for Marketing Area Faculty Recruiting, 1984, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1988

Faculty Advisor to the Student Chapter of the American Marketing Association,
University of Delaware 1986, 1987, (co-advisor) 1988, 1989

University Freshman Honors Advising, University of Delaware Honors Program
1984, 1985, 1986

MBA Committee, Department of Business Administration 1987

Honors Committee, Department of Business Administration 1987

Member of the Committee on Oversight, College of Business and Economics
1986, 1987

Chairperson for the Establishment of and Fund Raising for the Jerome Scott
Excellence in Marketing Graduation Award, Department of Business
Administration 1985, 1986

Computer Committee, Department of Business 1985, 1984

AWARDS, DISTINCTIONS AND MEMBERSHIPS

TEACHING:

The University of Texas at Arlington, College of Business Administration
Outstanding Undergraduate Teaching Award, 2002-2003

Selected for Who's Who in Business Higher Education, 2003

Selected for Who's Who Among America's Teachers, 2000.

RESEARCH:

Association of Marketing Theory and Practice: Top Paper in Track Award 2002

The University of Texas at Arlington, College of Business Administration
Distinguished Professional Publication Award, 1998-1999

McNair Minority Research Mentor Program, Sixth Place Award,
University of Texas at Arlington, 1996.

Robert Ferber Award, PhD Dissertation Competition, Honorable Mention, 1985.

OTHER AWARDS AND MEMBERSHIPS:

Delta Sigma Pi Business Fraternity, Honorary Faculty Member
Kent State University 1991.

American Marketing Association Doctoral Consortium Fellow, The Pennsylvania
State University 1982.

Alpha Mu Alpha, Honorary Marketing Society, The Pennsylvania State
University 1981.

Beta Gamma Sigma, Honorary Business Society, Syracuse University 1975.

The Mike Kinsella Student Activities Graduation Award Recipient, St.
Bonaventure University 1973.

American Marketing Association

Association For Consumer Research

CONSULTING AND EXECUTIVE EDUCATION

Delmarva Power Company, Inc., Wilmington, Delaware

Direct Marketing Direct Advertising (DMDA), Dallas, Texas

E. I. DuPont de Nemours and Company, Wilmington, Delaware

Executive Management Breakfast Series, Wilmington, Delaware

Lee Fulfillment Services, Inc., Dallas, Texas

Maryland Bank N.A. (MBNA), Wilmington, Delaware

Marketing Management Inc., Fort Worth, Texas

U.T. Southwestern Medical Center / Dallas,
Alliance for Medical Management Education

U.T. Dallas, Executive MBA Program

World Markets, Inc., Southlake, Texas

REFERENCES

John M. Beehler, Ph.D., CPA.
Dean and Professor of Accounting
W. Frank Barton School of Business
Wichita State University
1845 N. Fairmont
Wichita, KS 67260
(316)-978-3200
E-mail: John.Beehler@Wichita.edu

Thomas W. Leigh
Professor of Marketing
The University of Georgia
Terry College of Business
148 Brooks Hall
Athens, GA 30602-6258
(706) 542-3763 (Office)
(706) 546-8931 (Home)
E-mail: tleigh@cba.uga.edu

John L. Swasy, Professor
Department of Marketing
American University
Kogod College of Business
114 Battelle Bldg.
4400 Mass. Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016-8044
(202) 885-1974
(703) 442-0850
E-mail: jswasy@american.edu